

Application No. 10/626,498
Response dated May 6, 2005
In Reply to USPTO Corres. of Feb. 16, 2005
Attorney Docket No. 116-031421

REMARKS

The Applicants' have amended claims 1 and 4 to recite the X-ray detector, thus addressing the Examiner's rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 4 has been amended to set forth the use of "plural X-ray filters", thus addressing the Examiner's rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-3 and 5-8 were indicated allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The amendment to claim 4 overcomes the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for the reasons that claims 1-3 and 5-8 were indicated allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is urged this case is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

David C. Hanson, Reg. No. 23,024
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1845
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-Mail: webblaw@webblaw.com